

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 23 2006

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION  
UNDER 37 CFR §1.8**

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted on the date indicated below via facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, facsimile number (571) 273-8300.

Date: May 23, 2006

Brooke French  
Brooke French

In re application of: **Jorgenson**

Confirmation No.: **1553**

U.S. Application Number: **09/844,381**

Art Unit: **2155**

Filing Date: **April 27, 2001**

Examiner: **Bruckart, Benjamin R.**

Our Reference Number: **10005476-1 (50819-1380)**

Title: **System and Method for Controlling the Interruption and Resumption of  
Access to WWW Pages Requiring Certain Prerequisites**

**Appeal Brief Transmittal  
Appeal Brief**

**Total Pages Transmitted (including cover sheet) - 28**

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

## PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10005476-1IN THE  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor(s): Jorgenson

Confirmation No.: 1553

Application No.: 09/844,381

Examiner: Bruckhart, Benjamin R.

Filing Date: April 27, 2001

Group Art Unit: 2155

Title: System and Method for Controlling the Interruption and Resumption of Access to WWW Pages Requiring Certain Prerequisites

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents  
Commissioner For Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEFTransmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on March 30, 2006.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) \$500.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

☐ (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d)) for the total number of months checked below:

☐ 1st Month  
\$120

☐ 2nd Month  
\$450

☐ 3rd Month  
\$1020

☐ 4th Month  
\$1590

☐ The extension fee has already been filed in this application.

☒ (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account 08-2025 the sum of \$ 500. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

☐ I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
Date of Deposit:

OR

☒ I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number (571)273-8300.

Date of facsimile: May 23, 2006

Typed Name: Brooke French

Signature: Brooke French

Respectfully submitted,

Jorgenson

By Daniel R. McClure

Daniel R. McClure

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg No.: 38,862

Date: May 23, 2006

Telephone: (770) 933-9500

Rev 10/06 (ApfBref)

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 23 2006

PATENT


IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In Re Application of:	)	
	)	
D. Scott Jorgenson	)	Group Art Unit: 2155
	)	
Serial No.: 09/844,381	)	Examiner: Bruckart, Benjamin R.
	)	
Filed: April 27, 2001	)	Confirmation No.: 1553
	)	
For: System and Method for Controlling the	)	TKHR Docket: 50819-1380
Interruption and Resumption of Access to WWW	)	HP Ref.: 10005476-1
Pages Requiring Certain Prerequisites	)	

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR §1.8

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted on the date indicated below via facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Technology Group 2100, facsimile number (571) 273-8300. Total number of pages in this transmission 28.

May 23, 2006  
Date

  
Brooke French

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.192

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This is an appeal from the decision of Examiner Benjamin Bruckart, Group Art Unit 2155, mailed December 6, 2005, rejecting claims 1-23, 27-28, and 30-32 of the present application and making the rejection FINAL.

05/24/2006 STEUMEL1 00000071 082025 09844381

01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

### **I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest of the instant application is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, a Texas Limited Liability Partnership having its principal place of business in Houston, Texas.

### **II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

There are no related appeals or interferences.

### **III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claim 1-23, 27-28, and 30-32 are pending in this application, and all claims were rejected by the FINAL Office Action and are the subject of this appeal.

### **IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

All claim amendments submitted before the mailing date of the FINAL Office Action have been entered, and no claim amendments have been submitted subsequent to the mailing of the FINAL Office Action. A copy of the current claims is attached hereto as Appendix A.

### **V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

Embodiments of the claimed subject matter are illustrated in FIGs. 1 through 5 and are discussed in the specification at least at pages 16-32.

Embodiments of the invention, such as those defined by claim 1, define a method implemented at a Web server (see e.g., FIG. 4, reference number 16 and related description) for controlling the resumption of access to a World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

server and requiring at least one prerequisite, the method comprises receiving and evaluating a current HTTP request (see e.g., FIG. 5, reference numbers 202, 206, and 302 and related description) from a Web client (see e.g., reference number 12 and related description) to determine whether a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied; retrieving from a stored location information related to re-requesting a target HTTP request previously interrupted by the prerequisite (see e.g., FIG. 5, reference number 312 and related description), if the receiving and evaluating step determines that a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied; forming an HTTP response, which response includes contents for re-requesting from the Web client the target HTTP request; and transmitting the response to the Web client that transmitted the current HTTP request (see FIG. 5, reference number 310 and related description).

Embodiments of the invention, such as those defined by claim 12, define a method implemented at a Web server (see e.g., FIG. 2, reference number 16 and related description) for controlling the interruption of access to a World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web server and requiring at least one prerequisite, the method comprises receiving and evaluating a current HTTP request (see e.g., FIG. 3, reference numbers 202, 204, and 210 and related description) from a Web client (see e.g., reference number 12 and related description) to determine whether an unsatisfied prerequisite exists; saving to a stored location information related to re-requesting the current HTTP request (see e.g. FIG. 3, reference number 212 and related description) , if the receiving and evaluating step determines that an unsatisfied prerequisite exists; forming an HTTP response, which response omits desired contents from a location specified by the current HTTP request; and transmitting the response to the Web client that transmitted the current HTTP request (see e.g., FIG. 3, reference number 216 and related description).

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

Embodiments of the invention, such as those defined by claim 22, define Web server (see e.g., FIG. 4, reference number 16 and related description) for controlling the resumption of access to a World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web server and requiring at least one prerequisite (see e.g., FIG. 4, "prerequisite ... Target URL" and related description), the Web server comprises a first mechanism (see e.g., FIG. 4, reference number 120 and related description) configured to evaluate a current HTTP request from a Web client (see e.g., FIG. 4, reference number 12 and related description) to determine whether a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied; a second mechanism (see e.g., FIG. 4, reference number 122 and related description) configured to retrieve from a stored location (see e.g., FIG. 4, reference number 108 and related description) information related to re-requesting a target HTTP request previously interrupted by the prerequisite, in response to the first mechanism determining that a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied; a third mechanism (see e.g., FIG. 4, reference number 124 and related description) configured to form an HTTP response, which response includes contents for re-requesting from the Web client the target HTTP request; and a fourth mechanism configured to transmit the response to the Web client that transmitted the current HTTP request.

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

Embodiments of the invention, such as those defined by claim 28, define a Web server (see e.g., FIG. 2, reference number 16 and related description) for controlling the interruption of access to a World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web server and requiring at least one prerequisite, the Web server comprises a first mechanism (see e.g., FIG. 2, reference number 102 and related description) configured to evaluate a current HTTP request from a Web client (see e.g., FIG. 2, reference number 12 and related description) to determine whether an unsatisfied prerequisite exists; a second mechanism (see e.g., FIG. 2, reference number 106 and related description) configured to save to a stored location (see e.g., FIG. 2, reference number 108 and related description) information related to re-requesting the current HTTP request, in response to the first mechanism determining that an unsatisfied prerequisite exists; a third mechanism (see e.g., FIG. 2, reference number 110 and related description) configured to form an HTTP response, which response omits desired contents from a location specified by the current HTTP request; and a fourth mechanism configured to transmit the response to the Web client that transmitted the current HTTP request.

#### **VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

The FINAL Office Action rejected all claims 1-23, 27-28, and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,182,142 to Win et al. (hereafter Win).

#### **VII. ARGUMENT**

The FINAL Office Action repeated the rejections from the previous (non-FINAL) Office Action, and did not traverse the substantive distinctions that Applicant set forth in its previous response. Instead, the FINAL Office Action refused to accept the distinctions advanced by the

*Application of Jorgenson*  
*Ser. No. 09/844,381*

Applicant on the basis that they allegedly were not expressly embodied in the claims. For reasons that will be further set forth herein, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's position and submits that the rejections should be overturned.

#### **Fundamental Distinction of U.S. Patent 6,182,142**

For purposes of clarification, Applicant provides the following a high-level description of a fundamental distinction between the claimed embodiments and the cited Win reference. As set forth below, there are significant differences and distinctions between the presently claimed embodiments and the system disclosed by Win. As described in the specification of the present application, the claimed embodiments are directed to general-purpose Web server systems and methods for re-directing a Web user back to a page that the user was trying to access after some prerequisite for accessing the page (which was not satisfied at first) has become satisfied. The claimed embodiments are not limited to login or authorization matters, but more broadly to a variety of page requests that must be temporarily deferred or suspended, until some kind of pre-requisite has been satisfied. Suppose, for example, page X requires the user to have viewed a terms-and-conditions page first, and the user tries to access page X directly without having satisfied that pre-requisite. An embodiment of the invention interrupts the user's request for page X, sending the user elsewhere to view the terms-and-conditions page, and then resumes the user's interrupted request for X (without the user having to manually navigate back to page X himself) once the terms-and-conditions page has been viewed. No such teachings or solutions are disclosed, or even contemplated, in Win.

These and other differences (as expressly defined in the claims) will be pointed out below, in connection with the individual claims.

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

***Discussion of Claims 1-11***

The Office Action continued rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Win. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant disagrees and requests reconsideration of the rejections.

Claim 1 recites:

1. A method implemented at a Web server for controlling the resumption of access to a World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web server and requiring at least one prerequisite, the method comprising:  
receiving and evaluating a current HTTP request from a Web client to determine whether a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied;  
***retrieving from a stored location information related to re-requesting a target HTTP request previously interrupted by the prerequisite, if the receiving and evaluating step determines that a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied;***  
***forming an HTTP response, which response includes contents for re-requesting from the Web client the target HTTP request; and***  
transmitting the response to the Web client that transmitted the current HTTP request.

(*Emphasis added.*) Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 patently defines over Win for at least the reason that Win fails to disclose the features emphasized (bold and italics) above.

With regard to the “retrieving ...” element, the Office Action has relied upon col. 2, lines 41-65 and col. 3, lines 34-36 of Win as allegedly disclosing this feature. It does not. In fact, the cited portions of Win actually state:

One feature of this aspect is the steps of defining a role of the user; and storing an association of the user to the role at the second server. A related feature is the steps of defining one or more roles and functional groups of an organization to which the user belongs; storing information describing the roles and functional groups in association with information describing the user; and determining whether the user may access the resource based on the information describing the roles and functional groups.

According to another feature, the identifying step further comprises the

*Application of Jorgenson*  
*Ser. No. 09/844,381*

steps of connecting the first server to the second server, in which the second server stores information describing the user, one or more roles, one or more functional groups, the resources, and associations among them; and communicating a request for a profile of the user from the first server to the second server. In another feature, the receiving step further comprises the steps of receiving the information describing the user at a runtime module on the first server that also intercepts requests to access the resource. In yet another feature, the step of identifying further comprises the step of determining whether the user is authentic. A related feature is that the step of identifying further comprises the steps of communicating encrypted information between the first server and the second server describing resources that the user is authorized to use.

...  
... determining, based on the one or more tokens, whether the client is authorized to use the one of the resources ...

As can be readily verified from even a cursory review of the above-quoted portions of Win, the relevant features of claim 1 are not disclosed anywhere therein.

More particularly, the cited portion of Win (and surrounding text) describes a process whereby a user can log into a system through a client, and thereafter be permitted access to certain otherwise restricted information. Lines 41-49 of Win form a paragraph describing how that system stores role and functional group information for the user and defines to which pages those roles and groups allow access. The remaining lines (lines 50-65) form a second paragraph describing how that system stores user, role, and functional group information, communicates that information between the various server components of the system, and uses that information as a basis for authenticating user requests.

In contrast, claim 1 recites "retrieving from a stored location information related to re-requesting a target HTTP request previously interrupted by the prerequisite". There is no teaching in the cited portion of Win of the retrieving of "information related to *re-requesting* a target HTTP request *previously interrupted by the prerequisite*." For at least this reason, the

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

rejection of claim 1 is misplaced and should be overturned.

Significantly, there is nothing disclosed in the cited portions of WIN about retrieving previously saved information related to re-requesting a previously interrupted target page, as defined in claim 1. For at least this reason the rejection of claim 1 is misplaced and should be overturned.

As a separate and independent basis for the patentability of claim 1, the Office Action relied upon col. 8, lines 40-55 as allegedly teaching the “forming ...” element. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The “forming ...” element of claim 1 specifically defines “forming an HTTP response, *which response includes contents for re-requesting from the Web client the target HTTP request.*” In contrast, the cited portion of Win states:

...If the conditions are not satisfied, then the user cannot be authenticated, and as shown in state 314, Runtime Module 206 returns a redirection to the Login URL. As shown by state 316, HTTP Server 202 returns the redirection to the Login URL to the browser 100.

FIG. 3C is a state diagram showing processes carried out when the URL is a protected resource and the user is authenticated. After the user has been authenticated in state 312, Runtime Module 206 calls the Authorization Verification Service to check that the user has the right to access the protected resource. All authenticated users have the right to access “public” resources. In state 318, the Runtime Module 206 tests whether the resource is a public resource. If so, then Runtime Module 206 returns a direction to one or more resource pages, and HTTP Server 202 returns the redirection to browser 100, as shown by state 308.

As can be readily verified from even a cursory reading of the cited portion of Win, this teaching of Win merely teaches the redirection of a user to a login page, when the user is not logged-in (lines 40-44) and letting the user proceed on to the page he is trying to access when he is already logged-in and the page is public (lines 45-55). Significantly, however, this portion of Win does not teach the formation of an HTTP response, “*which response includes contents for re-requesting from the Web client the target HTTP request,*” as expressly recited in claim 1. In

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

this regard, this portion of the Win patent is describing the situation where a user is trying to access the page in the first place and the pre-requisites (login and authorization) are already satisfied. In contrast, the relevant element of claim 1 is concerned with the situation where such initial access fails so that, after the pre-requisite does eventually become satisfied, the user's original request is automatically resumed. That automatic resumption of a interrupted original request (what the claim refers to as the "target") is what claim 1 defines (and not the fulfillment of a request that already satisfies all the pre-requisites so never needs to be interrupted in the first place). For at least this separate and independent reason, the rejection of claim 1 is misplaced and should be overturned.

The undersigned understands that the FINAL Office Action has essentially ignored express language of claim 1 based on an argument that Applicant advanced in a previous response, which provided an illustration that utilized term that were not embodied in the claim. That is, the Office Action appears to have refused to fully consider previous arguments because the argument contained terms that were not included in the claim, and the FINAL Office Action states that the claim is being given its broadest possible construction. The undersigned submits, however, that even giving claim 1 its broadest reasonable construction, claim terms cannot be ignored.

As set forth in the discussion above, certain claim terms clearly define over the teachings of Win. These claim terms include "retrieving ... information related to *re-requesting a target HTTP request previously interrupted by the prerequisite, if the receiving and evaluating step determines that a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied*" and "*forming an HTTP response, which response includes contents for re-requesting from the Web client the target HTTP request.*" Simply stated no such comparable or even analogous feature exists in

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

Win, and for at least this reason the rejection of claim 1 should be overturned.

Claims 2-11 each depend from claim 1 and patently define over Win for at least the same reasons as claim 1. In addition, these claims define additional features that are not disclosed or suggested in Win. For example, claim 10 defines: "... wherein the HTTP response formed includes content to cause the Web client to automatically re-request the target HTTP request." Likewise, claim 11 defines: "...wherein the HTTP response formed includes content to inform and allow the user of the Web client to optionally re-request the target HTTP request."

With regard to claim 10, the Office Action again relied upon col. 8, lines 40-55 (quoted above) for allegedly disclosing the "forming..." element of claim 1. However, there is absolutely no teaching in this portion of Win that discloses the forming of an HTTP response to include "content to cause the Web client to automatically re-request the target HTTP request," as specifically recited by claim 10. For at least this additional reason, the rejection of claim 10 is misplaced and should be overturned.

With regard to claim 11, the Office Action relied upon col. 6, lines 6-24 and 48-61 as allegedly teaching the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees. These portions of Win actually state:

The system 2 also enables Users to log-in to the system once, and thereafter access one or more Resources during an authenticated session. Users may log in either with a digital certificate or by opening a login page URL with a web browser and entering a name and password. In the past, users have had to log in individually to each Web application that they are authorized to use. In the preferred embodiment, users always access the same login page regardless of the number of resources to which they need access. Thus, the system provides a mechanism of single secure log-in to Web resources.

If the login attempt is successful, the system 2 presents the User with a Personalized Menu that assists the User in identifying and selecting a Resource. In one embodiment, a Personalized Menu is an HTML page containing a list of authorized Resources. The Personalized Menu displays only Resources to which the User has access. The User can then select and access a Resource.

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

... Access Server 106 stores a log-in page, Authentication Client Module and Access Menu Module. The Authentication Client Module authenticates a user by verifying the name and password with the Registry Server 108. If the name and password are correct, the Authentication Client Module reads the user's roles from the Registry Server 108. It then encrypts and sends this information in a "cookie" to the user's browser. A "cookie" is a packet of data sent by web servers to web browsers. Each cookie is saved by browser 100 until the cookie expires. Cookies received from a web server in a specific domain are returned to web servers in that same domain during open URL requests. A cookie returned by the Authentication Client Module is required for access to resources protected by the system 2.

As can be readily verified from the above-quoted portion of Win, there is no teaching or disclosure of the claimed forming of an HTTP response to include "content to inform and allow the user of the Web client to optionally re-request the target HTTP request." In particular, a Personalized Menu listing available Resource options is not the same thing as a page inviting the user specifically to repeat his original request (right down to even the original request form parameters) and providing an option to do that, as claimed in the present application. For at least this separate and independent reason, the rejection of claim 11 should be overturned.

#### **Discussion of claims 12-21**

The Office Action, however, rejected claims 12-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Win. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant disagrees and requests reconsideration of the rejections.

Claim 12 recites:

12. A method implemented at a Web server for controlling the interruption of access to a World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web server and requiring at least one prerequisite, the method comprising:  
receiving and evaluating a current HTTP request from a Web client to determine whether an unsatisfied prerequisite exists;  
*saving to a stored location information related to re-requesting the current HTTP request, if the receiving and evaluating step determines that an*

*Application of Jorgenson*  
*Ser. No. 09/844,381*

*unsatisfied prerequisite exists;*  
*forming an HTTP response, which response omits desired contents*  
*from a location specified by the current HTTP request, and*  
transmitting the response to the Web client that transmitted the current  
HTTP request.

(Emphasis added.) Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 patently defines over Win for at least the reason that Win fails to disclose the features emphasized (bold and italics) above.

Applicant submits that additional distinctions define claim 12 over Win. For example, the Office Action has relied upon col. 24, lines 41-55 and col. 8, lines 14-31, col. 8, line 56 – col. 9, line 6, and col. 3, lines 34-36 as allegedly teaching the “saving ...” element. The Office Action also relies on col. 8, lines 56 – col. 9, line 6 as teaching the “forming ...” element. Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, Applicant fails to understand why the same teaching col. 8, line 56 – col. 9, line 6 has been cited for teaching two different claim element.

Turning first to teachings of Win relied of by the Office Action for allegedly teaching the “saving ...” element of claim 12, these cited portions of Win actually state:

Preferably, system 2 generates a runtime log file and a registry log file that report changes in the configuration of elements of the system, and errors.

The runtime log file is generated by Runtime Module 206 and reports possible errors that occur during initialization of the Runtime Module. The runtime log file also reports possible misuse of cookies, for example, a user attempting to use a cookie file copied or stolen from another user or machine.

The registry log file reports startup parameters of the Authentication Server module 606. The startup parameters include default time zone, whether SSL protocol is enabled, number of threads, etc. The registry log file also reports information about whether the Registry Server 108 started correctly.

(Col. 24, lines 41-55).

FIG. 3A is a state diagram showing certain actions carried out by Protected Server 104. As shown by state 302, a browser 100 issues an HTTP request, such as “Open the Resource designated by this URL,” and provides a URL as a parameter. For every HTTP request that is received, HTTP Server 202 sets a Web server environment variable “REMOTE\_ADDR” equal to the Internet Protocol

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

(IP) address of the requesting client or server. As shown by state 304, the HTTP Server 202 then calls the Runtime Module 206, which runs in the same process space as the HTTP Server, and passes it the browser's request. Runtime Module 206 determines whether the requested URL is a protected resource. If the requested URL is not a protected resource, then as shown by state 306, the Runtime Module takes no further action and passes control back to HTTP Server 202. As shown by state 308, the in response the HTTP Server 202 provides one or more Web pages containing the requested resource to the browser 100.

(Col. 8, lines 14-31).

*If the resource is not a public resource, then a user is allowed access only if the user is authorized, as shown by state 320. In the preferred embodiment, state 320 involves testing whether the request from browser 100 contains a "roles cookie" that can be decrypted, and the user has one or more roles, in a combination defined by an Access Rule. Each Access Rule is a Boolean expression of one or more roles. In an alternate embodiment, state 320 involves testing whether the user has at least one role needed to access the resource. If these conditions are satisfied, then the user is deemed authorized. If these conditions are not satisfied, the user does not have authorization and the Runtime Module returns a redirection to a pre-defined URL, as shown by state 322. Preferably, the pre-defined URL identifies a Web page that displays the message "Access Restricted," or an equivalent warning that informs the user that it cannot access the requested resource.*

(Emphasis added; Col. 8, line 56 – Col. 9, line 6).

Significantly, however, there is nothing disclosed about saving information related to re-requesting the current HTTP request to a stored location. In fact, the Office Action has failed to provide any analysis or application of the cited portions to the claimed features. Instead, the Office Action has merely quoted the claim language and cited these portions of Win (by column and line number). The undersigned fails to appreciate or understand virtually any relevance to the cited portions. With regard to the emphasized (bold and italics) portions above, it is clear this these portions of Win are concerned with ensuring that a user has "authorization" before being allowed access to a particular "resource."

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

However, there is no teaching or disclosure in the above-cited portions of Win of the claimed feature of “saving to a stored location *information related to re-requesting the current HTTP request*, if the receiving and evaluating step determines that an unsatisfied prerequisite exists.” For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 12 should be overturned.

In addition to the foregoing distinction, Win also fails to disclose other features of claim 12. For example, claim 12 expressly recites “*forming an HTTP response, which response omits desired contents from a location specified by the current HTTP request*.” The Office Action alleged that this feature is disclosed in Col. 8, line 56 – Col. 9, line 6 of Win. This portion of Win actually states:

If the resource is not a public resource, then a user is allowed access only if the user is authorized, as shown by state 320. In the preferred embodiment, state 320 involves testing whether the request from browser 100 contains a “roles cookie” that can be decrypted, and the user has one or more roles, in a combination defined by an Access Rule. Each Access Rule is a Boolean expression of one or more roles. In an alternate embodiment, state 320 involves testing whether the user has at least one role needed to access the resource. If these conditions are satisfied, then the user is deemed authorized. If these conditions are not satisfied, the user does not have authorization and the Runtime Module returns a redirection to a pre-defined URL, as shown by state 322. Preferably, the pre-defined URL identifies a Web page that displays the message “Access Restricted,” or an equivalent warning that informs the user that it cannot access the requested resource.

(Col. 8, line 56 – Col. 9, line 6).

There is no disclosure in the above-cited portion of Win of the formation of an HTTP response, which “omits desired contents from a location specified by the current HTTP request.”

Again, the Office Action fails to provide any application of this portion of Win to the claimed features. For at least this, the rejection of claim 12 is misplaced and should be overturned.

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

Claims 13-21 each depend from claim 12 and the rejections to these claims should be overturned for at least the same reasons.

#### Claims 22-27

The Office Action has rejected claims 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Win. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant disagrees and requests reconsideration of the rejections.

Claim 22 recites:

22. A Web server for controlling the resumption of access to a World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web server and requiring at least one prerequisite, the Web server comprising:

a first mechanism configured to evaluate a current HTTP request from a Web client to determine whether a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied;

*a second mechanism configured to retrieve from a stored location information related to re-requesting a target HTTP request previously interrupted by the prerequisite, in response to the first mechanism determining that a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied;*

*a third mechanism configured to form an HTTP response, which response includes contents for re-requesting from the Web client the target HTTP request; and*

a fourth mechanism configured to transmit the response to the Web client that transmitted the current HTTP request.

*(Emphasis added).* Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 patently defines over Win for at least the reason that Win fails to disclose the features emphasized (bold and italics) above.

Claim 22 is an apparatus claim defining elements that loosely correspond to the elements of method claim 1. Indeed, the rationale for the rejection of claim 22 closely parallels the rationale for the rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent claim 22 (and dependent claims 23-27) should be overturned for at least the same reason as the rejection of claim 1.

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

#### Claims 28-29

The Office Action, however, rejected claims 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Win. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant disagrees and requests reconsideration of the rejections.

Claim 28 recites:

28. A Web server for controlling the interruption of access to a World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web server and requiring at least one prerequisite, the Web server comprising:  
a first mechanism configured to evaluate a current HTTP request from a Web client to determine whether an unsatisfied prerequisite exists;  
***a second mechanism configured to save to a stored location information related to re-requesting the current HTTP request, in response to the first mechanism determining that an unsatisfied prerequisite exists;***  
a third mechanism configured to form an HTTP response, which response omits desired contents from a location specified by the current HTTP request; and  
a fourth mechanism configured to transmit the response to the Web client that transmitted the current HTTP request.

*(Emphasis added)*. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 28 patently defines over Win for at least the reason that Win fails to disclose the features emphasized (bold and italics) above.

Claim 28 is an apparatus claim defining elements that loosely correspond to the elements of method claim 12. Indeed, the rationale for the rejection of claim 28 closely parallels the rationale for the rejection of claim 12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent claim 28 (and dependent claim 29) should be overturned for at least the same reason as the rejection of claim 12.

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

### CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing discussion, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's final rejection of claims 1-23, 27-28, and 30-32 be overturned by the Board, and that the application be allowed to issue as a patent with all pending claims 1-23, 27-28, and 30-32.

In addition to the claims of Appendix A, Appendix B attached hereto indicates that there is no evidence being attached and relied upon by this brief. Appendix C attached hereto indicates that there are no related proceedings.

Please charge Hewlett-Packard Company's deposit account 08-2025 in the amount of \$500 for the filing of this Appeal Brief. No additional fees are believed to be due in connection with this Appeal Brief. If, however, any additional fees are deemed to be payable, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fees to deposit account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel R. McClure  
Registration No. 38,962

(770) 933-9500

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

### **VIII. CLAIMS - APPENDIX**

1. A method implemented at a Web server for controlling the resumption of access to a World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web server and requiring at least one prerequisite, the method comprising:

receiving and evaluating a current HTTP request from a Web client to determine whether a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied;

retrieving from a stored location information related to re-requesting a target HTTP request previously interrupted by the prerequisite, if the receiving and evaluating step determines that a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied;

forming an HTTP response, which response includes contents for re-requesting from the Web client the target HTTP request; and

transmitting the response to the Web client that transmitted the current HTTP request.

2. The method according to claim 1, wherein the prerequisite is an authentication prerequisite.

3. The method according to claim 1, wherein the prerequisite is an entitlement prerequisite.

4. The method according to claim 1, wherein the prerequisite is a workflow prerequisite.

5. The method according to claim 1, wherein the information retrieved from the stored location includes the original target URL, queries, and form arguments.

*A-1*

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

6. The method according to claim 1, wherein the information retrieved from the stored location includes sufficient additional state information, so that re-request contents within the HTTP response are adequate for the Web client to repeat the target HTTP request as originally transmitted.

7. The method according to claim 1, wherein the information retrieved from the stored location includes the type of prerequisite previously unsatisfied for the target HTTP request.

8. The method according to claim 1, wherein the stored location uses client-side session state.

9. The method according to claim 1, wherein the stored location uses server-side session state.

10. The method according to claim 1, wherein the HTTP response formed includes content to cause the Web client to automatically re-request the target HTTP request.

11. The method according to claim 1, wherein the HTTP response formed includes content to inform and allow the user of the Web client to optionally re-request the target HTTP request.

12. A method implemented at a Web server for controlling the interruption of access to a

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web server and requiring at least one prerequisite,  
the method comprising:

receiving and evaluating a current HTTP request from a Web client to determine whether  
an unsatisfied prerequisite exists;

saving to a stored location information related to re-requesting the current HTTP request,  
if the receiving and evaluating step determines that an unsatisfied prerequisite exists;

forming an HTTP response, which response omits desired contents from a location  
specified by the current HTTP request; and

transmitting the response to the Web client that transmitted the current HTTP request.

13. The method according to claim 7, wherein the prerequisite is an authentication prerequisite.

14. The method according to claim 7, wherein the prerequisite is an entitlement prerequisite.

15. The method according to claim 7, wherein the prerequisite is a workflow prerequisite.

16. The method according to claim 12, wherein the information saved to the stored  
location includes the current URL, queries, and form arguments.

17. The method according to claim 12, wherein the information saved to the stored  
location includes sufficient additional state information, so that an HTTP response may later be

A-3

*Application of Jorgenson  
Ser. No. 09/844,381*

generated containing contents adequate for the Web client to re-request the current HTTP request as originally transmitted.

18. The method according to claim 12, wherein the information saved to the stored location further includes the type of prerequisite that is unsatisfied.

19. The method according to claim 12, wherein the stored location uses client-side session state.

20. The method according to claim 12, wherein the stored location uses server-side session state.

21. The method according to claim 12, wherein the HTTP response formed includes content to inform and allow the user of the Web client to optionally initiate activity to satisfy the unsatisfied prerequisite.

22. A Web server for controlling the resumption of access to a World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web server and requiring at least one prerequisite, the Web server comprising:

a first mechanism configured to evaluate a current HTTP request from a Web client to determine whether a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied;

a second mechanism configured to retrieve from a stored location information related to re-requesting a target HTTP request previously interrupted by the prerequisite, in response to the first mechanism determining that a previously unsatisfied prerequisite has been satisfied;

A-4

*Application of Jorgenson*  
*Ser. No. 09/844,381*

a third mechanism configured to form an HTTP response, which response includes contents for re-requesting from the Web client the target HTTP request; and

a fourth mechanism configured to transmit the response to the Web client that transmitted the current HTTP request.

23. The Web server according to claim 22, wherein each of the first, second, third, and fourth mechanisms are implemented in software.

24-26 (Canceled).

27. The Web server according to claim 22, wherein the Web server collectively comprises multiple computers that collaborate.

28. A Web server for controlling the interruption of access to a World Wide Web page to be supplied by the Web server and requiring at least one prerequisite, the Web server comprising:

a first mechanism configured to evaluate a current HTTP request from a Web client to determine whether an unsatisfied prerequisite exists;

a second mechanism configured to save to a stored location information related to re-requesting the current HTTP request, in response to the first mechanism determining that an unsatisfied prerequisite exists;

a third mechanism configured to form an HTTP response, which response omits desired contents from a location specified by the current HTTP request; and

a fourth mechanism configured to transmit the response to the Web client that transmitted

*Application of Jorgenson*  
*Ser. No. 09/844,381*

the current HTTP request.

29 (Canceled).

30. The method according to claim 12, wherein the HTTP response formed includes content to automatically initiate activity to satisfy the unsatisfied prerequisite.

31. The Web server according to claim 28, wherein each of the first, second, third, and fourth mechanisms are implemented in software.

32. The Web server according to claim 28, wherein the Web server collectively comprises multiple computers that collaborate.

A-6

*Application of Jorgenson*  
*Ser. No. 09/844,381*

**IX. EVIDENCE - APPENDIX**

None.

*B-1*

*Application of Jorgenson*  
*Ser. No. 09/844,381*

**IX. RELATED PROCEEDINGS- APPENDIX**

None.

*C-1*